

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 3

changes. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, page 11, lines 28-30; and page 21, lines 21-24. Applicants maintain that the amendments to the claims do not raise any issue of new matter. Accordingly, claims 17, 19-21, 34 and 35 are now pending in the subject application.

Pursuant to the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.121, applicants annex hereto as **Exhibit A**, a marked-up version of the amended claims.

In view of the arguments set forth below, applicants maintain that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome, and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw same.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 17-21, 33, 34, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Chintala et al (Cancer Lett 103:201-208, 1996) ("Chintala").

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 18, 33, 37 and 38, but without conceding the correctness thereof, applicants point out that these claims have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Further, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 17, 19-21 and 34.

Claims 17, 19-21 and 34, as amended, provide a method for evaluating the ability of an agent to inhibit tumor cell spreading. Claim 17, in relevant part, recites the step of "admixing with cell

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 4

culture media an effective amount of an agent known to inhibit the interaction between a tumor cell and an extracellular matrix molecule."

For a reference to anticipate the instant invention, it would have to teach all the elements thereof.

Chintala fails to teach each and every element of the claimed method. Specifically, Chintala fails to teach the step of "admixing with cell culture media an effective amount of an agent known to inhibit the interaction between a tumor cell and an extracellular matrix molecule." It follows that Chintala cannot teach the instant method for evaluating the ability of an agent to inhibit tumor cell spreading. Accordingly, applicants maintain that Chintala fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

The Examiner also rejected claims 17-21, 33-35, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Softer et al (PNAS 89:1557-1561, 1992) ("Softer").

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 18, 33, 37 and 38, but without conceding the correctness thereof, applicants again point out that these claims have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Further, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 17, 19-21, 34 and 35.

Claims 17, 19-21, 34 and 35, as amended, are discussed above.

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 5

Softer fails to teach each and every element of the claimed method. Specifically, like Chintala, Softer fails to teach the step of "admixing with cell culture media an effective amount of an agent known to inhibit the interaction between a tumor cell and an extracellular matrix molecule," and thus, applicants maintain that Softer fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

The Examiner also rejected claims 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by each of U.S. Patent No. 5,981,478 ("Ruoslathi"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,767,071 ("Pallandino").

In response to the Examiner's rejections of claims 37 and 38, but without conceding the correctness thereof, applicants again point out that these claims have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejections thereof moot.

In view of the above remarks, applicants maintain that claims 17, 19-21, 34 and 35 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 17-21, 33-35, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that it is unclear what comprises "a local cellular environment" in this context.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 18, 33, 37 and 38, but without conceding the correctness thereof, applicants again point out that these claims have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 6

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 17, 19-21, 34 and 35, but without conceding the correctness thereof, applicants again point out that amended claim 17 does not recite the phrase "a local cellular environment."

The Examiner also rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the term "small molecule" is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite.

In response to the Examiner's rejection, but without conceding the correctness thereof, applicants point out that amended claim 21 does not recite the term "small molecule."

In view of the above remarks, applicants maintain that claims 17, 19-21, 34 and 35 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Summary

For the reasons set forth hereinabove, applicants respectfully request that all the claims of this application be allowed, and that the application proceed to issuance.

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, applicants' undersigned attorneys invite the Examiner to telephone them at the number provided below.

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 7

No fee is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this Amendment. However, if any fee is required, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of such fee to Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Alan J. Morrison
Reg. No. 37,399

Date

7/10/03

John P. White
Registration No. 28,678
Alan J. Morrison
Registration No. 37,399
Attorneys for Applicants
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Tel. No. (212) 278-0400

Marked-up Version of the Claims

17. (amended) A method for evaluating the ability of an agent to inhibit tumor cell spreading [invasion in a local cellular environment] which comprises:
- (a) admixing with cell culture media an effective amount of an [the] agent known to inhibit the interaction between a tumor cell and an extracellular matrix molecule;
 - (b) contacting a tumor cell in cell culture with media from step (a);
 - (c) determining the amount of spreading of the tumor cell in the cell culture; [,] and
 - (d) comparing the amount of spreading of the tumor cell [culture] determined in step (c) with the amount determined in the absence of the agent, thus evaluating the ability of the agent to inhibit tumor [invasion in the local cellular environment] cell spreading.
21. (amended) The method of claim 17, wherein the agent comprises a peptide, a peptidomimetic, a nucleic acid, a synthetic organic molecule, an inorganic molecule, a carbohydrate, a lipid, or an antibody or fragment thereof [or a small molecule].
34. (amended) The method of claim 17 [21], wherein the extracellular matrix molecule is a laminin, a fibronectin, an amphoterin, a cadherin, an integrin or a hyaluronic acid.